

# **BEHIND THE SCENE: STUDENT-CREATED VIDEO AS A MEANING-MAKING PROCESS TO PROMOTE STUDENT ACTIVE LEARNING**

by **Ismail Anas**

Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang,

Makassar, Indonesia

[ismailanas@poliupg.ac.id](mailto:ismailanas@poliupg.ac.id)

## **Abstract**

Although many studies reported that student-created video task could promote learners' active learning and engagement, the investigation on how the students worked and created the videos is still scarce. The process of video creation in a micro-reality context of English language learning involves social practice and cognition (a socio-cognitive process) of the students. The student-created video is an output-based learning activity that reflects a meaning-making process upon the completion of the project. This paper sheds light on how the students worked on the project through such stages as preparing the materials, setting the scene, selecting the video recording tool and editing the video before the submission. Encapsulated from the videos and semi-structured interviews from 41 Polytechnic students in Indonesia, the approaches that students employed during the process of video creation were explored to arrive at a meaning-making process of learning. As a result, the activity enabled the student active learning, vocabulary building, autonomous learning and self-confidence as well as the student's technological skill. In addition to that, the challenges encountered by the students during the video-making process will also be presented.

**Keywords:** student-created video; meaning-making process; active learning; ELL

## **1. Introduction**

The advances and innovations in educational technology have brought about significant changes to the way people interact and learn such as ease of access to the Internet, media technology and hand-held devices. Given the importance of technology in language learning, Motteram (2013) emphasized a systematic and comprehensive overview of the current use of technology to support English teaching and learning. One of the emerging strategies in English teaching is the use of videos to support and engage student learning as well as increase their participation in the lesson (Bangs, 1990; Shrosbree, 2008). In this digital era, the use of video-based materials in English language teaching (ELT) has attracted more attention from ELT practitioners worldwide. Both teachers and students can now have wide access to technological

tools for use in learning activities such as Android-based smartphones, tablets, iPads, and digital cameras.

There have been many studies in the literature which report that student-created video can promote learners' active learning and engagement (e.g. Baker, 2016; Sherer & Shea, 2011; Wagener, 2006). So far, however, little attention was devoted to investigating how the students worked on the video-making processes as a social learning practice that informed a meaning-making process. In the current study, the video-making process involved several steps starting from preparing the materials, setting the scene, selecting a video recording tool, and editing the video before the submission. These processes informed a social learning practice and cognition of the students. In addition to this, the student-created video is an output of a process that no one knows clearly what is behind. By knowing what happened to the students, the teachers will be able to address the right approaches to working with them. The teachers will also be able to give them assistance in which specific area of the project they need help.

## **2. Literature review**

### **2.1. The use of video in English Language Teaching and Learning (ELTL)**

The importance of the use of video in the language learning setting has been widely argued as a potential locus to bring a significant contribution to the improvement of students' pragmatic-linguistic competence (Kelly, 1985). She also emphasized the use of video as a modeling device, input for viewing and stimulus for discussion. Today, however, with the advancement and development of technology in the last few decades, the use of video has been transformed into many kinds of learning strategies. In the practice of ELT, video can promote learning engagement and participation (Hughes & Robertson, 2010). The authors specifically looked at the teachers' perception of digital media use and multiple literacies; however, it is also necessary to have a close look at the matter from the student learning perspective.

Some previous relevant studies in the area of video-based teaching strategies reported that its uptake could help improve learning effectiveness and students' satisfaction. For instance, these studies encompassed the use of video in a blended learning setting (Shih, 2010), video chats in an online conversation (Sindoni, 2011), video-based materials (Lin, 2011) and online video streaming YouTube (Terantino, 2011). However, these studies mainly point out the advantages and effectiveness of using videos as emerging technologies for language learning. Meanwhile, it is important to investigate the students' voices when a teacher exposes them to the video creation process. Obviously, there is an empirical gap concerning the student's

involvement who are considered passive learners. Using video as another blended learning tool, the students need a space to express their personal feelings (emotions), ideas and stories as a lived experience as well as a way of enacting social practices (Widodo, Budi, & Wijayanti, 2016).

This study also aims to provide a clear picture of the importance of involving the students as active agents in which they can cultivate knowledge and make meaning from their experience. Beyond the classroom context, lived experience supports contextual and social learning to make meaning of what they are doing.

## **2.2. Student-created video and student active learning**

Student-Created Video (SCV) as evidence-based learning is relatively a novel practice in English language teaching and learning (Naqvi, 2015). SCV could support the student learning and encourage learners to construct new knowledge as they were exposed to the video-making activity, meanwhile, it could also improve student motivation and active learning engagement (Navqi, 2015). The author claimed that SCV had a huge potential for language learning and suggested the language teaching practitioners incorporate SCV projects into their course, however, there is one interesting issue about the scientific evidence for SCV to what extent it improves the student active learning without investigating its meaning-making process. The same claim reported by Engin (2014) is that SCV could promote second language learning but the study did not examine how SCV brought a meaningful process to the students' knowledge, cognition and learning experience.

## **2.3. Learning beyond the classroom**

Before the age of technology, learning was confined in classroom-based interactions in which the students had limited access to a wider sense of knowledge and information. Today, the advances in web-based and hand-held devices technology (e.g. social networking sites, mobile apps, and LMS) provide a greater opportunity for meaningful and authentic use of language than what the student can get from the classroom (Richards, 2015). It is now possible to extend learning beyond the classroom context where the students can now engage and participate in many kinds of online communities of practice. Ting (2013) argues that student-created video could help the student build a link between language learning and real-life experience beyond the classroom context. She also added that the activity allowed the student to share different ideas and to negotiate meaning.

Based on these findings, the students could now be exposed to a flexible learning activity either inside or outside the classroom using various strategies and learning media. For instance, working with the SCV project requires a long process before the completion and submission of the task. The students need a span of time to search for and find information, create the setting, learn the technological tools and create the video in which these activities need a longer period to get the SCV project accomplished. Practically, in consideration with regular length (mostly 90 to 120 minutes) of classroom teaching time, these perennial processes is considered too demanding for the in-classroom project implementation.

#### **2.4. A meaning-making process of learning**

During the video-making project, the intrapersonal learning of each student could be influenced by the student context of interactions and cultural setting that informed a meaning-making process (Theron & Theron, 2014). Therefore, a closer look at the process of learning and interactions between the students would give a clearer picture of how they were exposed to such a form of learning. For instance, the student-created video is an output and a result of a socio-cognitive process that contains meaningful processes that shape learning. Behind the scene, the students would spend a lot of time and effort to explore the video-making process starting from pre- to post-activities which involved the student's social practice and cognition, reflection, adaptive learning, flexibility and a sense of creativity situated within a micro-reality context of English language learning. Therefore, a meaning-making process that promotes active learning must involve student learning with flexibility and adaptive intelligence (Myers as cited in Young & Bush, 2004). When a teacher assigns students to work on a project, he/she might not know what empirical evidence occurred during the process of project implementation.

#### **2.5. Task-based language teaching and learning**

A myriad of resources in the area of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in the literature has advocated its effectiveness in increasing the student's participation in learning. The advances in educational and Internet technology over the last few years have brought strong support to TBLT practice. Thomas and Reinders (2010) raised the issues on the technology approach to promote *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching (TBLT)* as a strategy for language teaching and learning. The utilization of technology has made it possible to support the implementation of task-based teaching out of the classroom (Richards, 2015). Nunan (2006) stated that TBLT has brought contribution to the following principles and practices:

1. a needs-based approach to content selection;
2. an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language;
3. the introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation;
4. the provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning process itself;
5. an enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning;
6. the linking of classroom language learning with language use outside the classroom.

There has been a lot of research evidence reported in the literature regarding the role of SCV in promoting learning effectiveness/advantages, student satisfaction, learning engagement, students' learning motivation, and students' new knowledge construction. However, it is not obvious how those claims were shaped and to what extent SCV promotes students' active learning. Therefore, it is necessary to have a closer look at the students' lived experience on how they build links between SCV and active learning. This paper will not only elucidate the language learning process through SCV but will also delineate the students' experience during the process.

### **3. The current study**

#### **3.1. Context and design**

This research employed a qualitative design (Braun & Clarke, 2013) investigating a meaning-making process of the student-created video task in a micro-reality context of English language learning. Informed by the Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching with Technology (Thomas & Reinders, 2010) approach, the study sought to investigate and understand the meaning-making practices of the participants on how they worked on the task. The methodology of task-based instruction focused on two main procedures that specified the activities of the participants working on the video-making task and how teachers and learners participated in the lesson (Ellis, 2006). Informed by Ellis's framework of designing task-based lessons, the procedure went through three phases:

- 1) *pre-task* (framing the activity, planning time, doing similar task),
- 2) *during task* (time pressure, number of participants),
- 3) *post-task* (learner report, consciousness-raising, reflection).

Table 1. Tasking procedure

Phase	Activities
Pre-task (preparation)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The teacher gave a thorough introduction to the task (what, why, and how to do the task).</li> <li>2. The teacher explained the structure of the task (video-making task, duration/the length of the video, the language, and flow of the talk).</li> <li>3. The teacher explained the technological tools they could use to perform the task (video/sound recording, video editing software).</li> <li>4. Task modeling (engaging participants to the task)</li> </ol>
During-task (action)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Self-study and group discussion about the task topic</li> <li>2. Preparing the technological tools needed for the video-making takes</li> <li>3. Lesson planning (this was a step where the participants designed a plan for the video-taking session. It covers some aspects such as the opening, the main talk, the closing, the lighting, the sound, the angle/position, etc).</li> <li>4. Practice, self-evaluation, and re-practice</li> <li>5. Video-recording</li> <li>6. Video editing</li> <li>7. Video submission</li> </ol>
Post-task (reflection)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The teacher watched the submitted videos for several times.</li> <li>2. Reflecting on the task (teacher and students view the videos together and performed a teacher-student discussion about the videos.</li> <li>3. Focusing on forms (review of learner errors, consciousness-raising task, production practice activities, and noticing activities)</li> </ol>

Table 1 describes the tasking procedure in three sequential phases which are pivotal in the TBLT process. Each participant involved in the task went through all the three phases and demonstrated different meaning-making practices that they have experienced (see Findings and discussion below). Given the importance of clear instructions to the task, the participants were given a step-by-step guidance into performing the activities starting from the preparation stage to the final work of the task. It aimed to give a general understanding and thorough comprehension of the task procedure so they would have the same perception on how to work on it and what technological tools needed for its application.

#### Task

You are going to work on a task (in a group of 3) to create a video of interviewing your friends about past time activities. The aim of this task is to allow you to practice your English involving video-recording technology as a tool for your learning. The task can be done either on campus or out of campus. To do the task, follow these instructions:

1. Study carefully the Past Simple topic again and make sure you have a good understanding of it before moving to the next step of this task. If you have questions regarding the topic, you can either text me your questions or meet me for a discussion.
2. Prepare your materials (the lists of past questions) and each question is typed in a big font on an A4 size paper (layout: landscape). E.g. *How was your last holiday? Where was it? What did you do? Etc.* These questions are ONLY examples, you can create more interesting questions for your task.
3. Prepare the recording tool you are going to use (camera, handphone with the camera, pocket camera or any other types of recording tools that you are familiar with).
4. Grab the recording tools and the questions papers and then find a friend to interview (e.g. Android-based smartphones, tablets, i-Pads, and digital cameras).
5. Before you start the interview, ask your friend for his/her willingness and readiness for the interview. Explain the purpose and the structure of the interview (tell how you will do that, how many questions will be asked, where you want to do the interview, and in what language the interview will be).

6. When your interviewee is ready, turn your camera on. Before you turn to the questions, please give a brief introduction. Ex. *Hello, I am (say your name) and I am going to ask you some questions relating to your past activities. Anyway, What's your name? How are you doing today?* Etc.
7. Tell your interviewee that you are going to show him/her some question cards. Ask him/her to talk to the camera (recording) about the answers to the questions. You can do some takes (take 1, 2, or 3) until you are satisfied with your work.
8. After you have finished recording, you can edit the video using any video-editing software that you are familiar with. You can add a short intro to your video opening, some texts, and transitions between different scenes.
9. Submit the video to your teacher and make sure it is playable.
10. You will be invited to talk about your experience working on the task.
11. Finally, you will be asked to fill out the reflection form/journal (a 2 week reflection) regarding your experience during the task. It aims to measure the effectiveness of video-making task in promoting your active learning.

Note: Please be willing to document every single phase of your project/task by either taking some pictures or videotaping your activities. For instance, do take some pictures or videos when you are working on the task (video taking sessions, video editing, group discussions, etc.).

### 3.2. The participants

The study took place in one of the Indonesian state polytechnics involving two classes of non-EFL students (N=41). The students were from the business administration department who studied English as a compulsory subject demanded by the curriculum.

Table 2. The characteristics of the participants

Characteristics	Group1 (N=19)	Group 2 (N=22)
Sex (M/F)	7/12	8/14
Mean age at enrollment (years)	18-20	19-20
Type of smartphone (android/iOS)	17/2	21/1
Level of English proficiency (Elementary/Pre-intermediate/Intermediate)	2/10/7	4/12/6

The participants were students of mixed proficiency levels ranging from elementary to intermediate. At the time of the study, the participants were at the second level of the course of English in which the core content of the course put an emphasis on the student's speaking performance. The speaking performance can be accelerated through the utilization of technology (video-making task) that empowers students to engage themselves in the learning process.

### 3.3. Data collection procedures

Regarding the research implementation, I gained access to the field as a lecturer in charge of the English conversation course. About the video-making task, I negotiated the purpose of the task with the students before the study. I discussed some important issues relating to the task



such as the availability of the technological tools, implementation procedures, the length of time and their willingness to work on the project. It was necessary to make sure that the students have access to the technological tools and the Internet. The types of technological tools and project-related software were not agreed. This strategy allowed the student to select the devices which they needed to work on the task.

Besides that, the study could reveal the process of tools selection and the students' preference for the use of technology. The students were also exposed to the use of the Internet in finding relevant information such as ESL conversation questions sites and video-streaming sites (e.g. YouTube). Regarding the implementation procedures, I explained step-by-step the procedure of conducting the video-taking session (see task). Furthermore, I negotiated the length of time and the project timeline to give a clear picture of what they were going to do. They agreed to a two-week period by following the project timeline. I also want to emphasize the importance of project negotiation that helped the students figure out what they would like to learn and what they expected from the study.

Regarding the ethical concerns of using the video data, I discussed and negotiated the purpose of the collected videos with the participants, explaining how the videos would be used. I told the students that the videos would be used for data analysis only and would not be distributed in any kind of forms. They were worried about the content misuse so we both agreed to use the collected videos for research data analysis only. They all agreed that I could use the video recordings for data analysis and for purpose of academic writing, but they requested that the videos not be posted on *YouTube* and any other types of social media (e.g. *Facebook, Instagram, Twitter*). Therefore, the collected videos were saved in the researcher's personal repository and not posted in any kind of social media. In terms of the legal concern, the points of negotiation are stated in the letter of agreement signed by both teachers and participants.

To understand the students' meaning-making experience and feeling, the student-created videos were collected for further analysis. Firstly, the collected videos were played repeatedly to find out themes and patterns. The themes and patterns were categorized to get a clear picture of what empirical evidence occurred during the making process of the project. Secondly, I used the findings from the previous analysis to conduct an interview session with the students to dig up clear information regarding the submitted videos. The steps of the interview were as follows:

1. Watching the videos together with the students
2. Pausing the video at some particular scenes to ask the student about them.



3. Noticing down the information obtained from the student
4. Analyzing the field notes by reading them several times
5. Collecting and analyzing the self-reflection forms from the participants
6. Writing up

#### **4. Findings and discussion**

This section reports the research findings related to a video-making project conducted in a micro-reality context of English language learning at one of the state polytechnics in Indonesia. It reveals some empirical evidence fostering the students' experience when they were exposed to a video-making activity. They worked in 2-3 students forming a team with different responsibilities of each person – one was an interviewer, and another was a cameraman. The team worked together starting from the preparation to the production of the video. This activity involved various socio-cognitive processes that contributed to the student learning experience. During the project, the students were exposed to a series of activities that built their knowledge and understanding about the meaning-making practice in each process they had experienced.

##### **4.1. Student-prepared materials before the video-taking session**

Organizing the resources for use in the video-making session promotes firm collaboration among the team members. They would need to take some time to discuss the task and decided on what to do. In this very beginning stage, they started to negotiate some relevant ideas such as when to start, where and when to do it. When the students were exposed to such a situation, they would come to discuss their roles for the task in which they tempted to negotiate the roles that they appeared to be familiar with. This situation encouraged the students to dig up their prior knowledge and cognition about what they are going to do. The lack of the students' prior knowledge is one of the three difficulties confronting L2 learners in which they had no enough understanding of the topic (Chiang & Dunkel, 1992). For instance, if a student were assigned to create a video, he would not be able to get it done unless he had a good understanding of the video recording tool as well as the competence of using it.

The following excerpt is not the original version; it has been reconstructed regarding language structure but not in its meaning.

*Excerpt 1:*

*T: How did you prepare your materials/resources before you started the project?*

*Tell me more about your roles?*

*St:...Hmm, I was responsible for the scenario, and my friend also helped me with some ideas. We worked together at my rent house because she lived nearby.*

*T: How did you work on it?*

*St: We created some questions in a list, then we sorted them out to find the interesting and relevant questions to the topic.*

*T: Tell me why you decided to work on the scenario?*

*S: I found my self comfortable and familiar with that and my friend was good at technology tools. FYI, I was not good at video capturing and editing.*

Excerpt 1 mainly shows how the students organized the task and the role strategy as well. It happened in a micro-social context of student interaction concerning the video-making project. The activity was also done beyond the classroom setting that allowed the students to find a more flexible time and place. This finding is in line with Lund (2003) emphasizing that the social space (time and place) for EFL practice should be extended to create more learning spaces beyond the classroom environment. The social space allowed the students to improve their learning interaction as well as the ease of access to knowledge and information.

*Excerpt 2*

*T: Where did you get these questions? (while pointing the questions list made by the students)*

*S: Some of them were from the internet sir, and the rest were from us.*

They cultivated the information from online resources that are available on the Internet. If the students are aware of the Internet, they will consider it as a powerful tool to assist them in information searching and processing. This skill is no longer a major problem for students as the students' engagement in technology has been increasing in the last few years. In this process, the students would be able to interrogate their existing knowledge and understanding, therefore, it would help them improve their cognition.

#### **4.2. Student-selected scene-setting**

Informed by the videos submitted by the students, the selection of scene-setting for backgrounds commonly took place in campus environments. They came with different reasons underpinning their choices such as flexibility, easiness, noise, and background views. Regarding the flexibility, the students tended to seek a flexible place (informal, relaxing, and adjustable) to start making a video recording. The meaning of informal in this matter is beyond the lecture sessions in which they found it more relaxing and adjustable. The easiness was related to the condition where they could find a place without any administrative procedures

such as classrooms, parks, student unions, and cars. They also avoided crowded places such as a canteen, a faculty lobby, a sports center, a laboratory, and a library.

*Excerpt 3*

*T: Where was this video taken?*

*S: In the class, sir.*

*T: Why?*

*S: Hmm..It was less distortion, not noisy, and hmm..not many people, sir.*

*T: You were shy, weren't you?*

*S: Yes sir, my English not good.*

The classroom became the most favorite place to do the task because it is a quiet place with less distortion which could affect the sound quality. All videos submitted by the students were taken in quiet places indicating the students' preferences about the scenes. It is understandable that they were novice English learners so they might be shy to speak English in front of the public. It can be inferred that they were not confident enough to make videos in the public area. Interestingly, a group of students made the video in a car which was overly considered isolated from the public. This evidence strengthens the findings that they were facing a big problem regarding speaking confidence.

### **4.3. Student-selected recording tools**

In the current technology era, the availability of technology tools has brought an impact on students' preferences in choosing and using recording tools for their video projects. They were allowed to use any kind of recording tools which they were familiar with. Evidently, they were mostly interested in the use of hand-held devices such as Android-based smartphone, tablet, and iPad. None of the students used Handycam, digital camera, and action camera which were not easy-use and flexible.

*Excerpt 4*

*T: What recording tool did you use for this project?*

*S: I used my handphone sir?*

*T: Why?*

*S: Handphone is simple sir, easy to use, and I can edit directly on it.*

*T: Why not Handycam or digital camera?*

*S: Complicated sir, difficult to move the file and to edit it. It also takes time.*

Allowing the students to freely choose the recording tools for their projects encouraged the students' creativity and prior technological knowledge that teachers might not know. The

student's creativity in using technological tools had a positive impact on the results of the project in which they created more fancy editing, eye-catching and updated products. Using an Android-based smartphone allowed them to explore more applications in the *App Store* which they could download and install on their devices. Default cameras in most smartphones offer limited features that the students can explore and utilize. Once the video has been captured, then they can just edit it using a specific application afterward. One-stop video processing tools were mostly preferred due to their easiness and flexibility.

#### **4.4. Student-selected video editing tools**

As mentioned before, the students' preferred tools for the video-making project were the Android-based applications downloaded and installed from the *Apps Store*. The selection of editing tools or software varied in many cases, including *Windows Movie Maker* as an additional tool to make changes in the video. The prior technological knowledge also underpinned this selection process in which what the students know, believe, and always do influenced their decision to pick a particular video editing tool. They selected WMV because that is the software which the students are familiar with. Otherwise, they would not use software or application if they don't have any competence in it.

Behind this selection process, there was more evidence that suggested a meaning-making process in that some students/groups were not involved in the editing process. They asked someone else from other departments who was competent enough to do such work. The focus here is not merely on the output of the process but on what happened during the process. This encompassed inquiring into what the students did, how much effort they had tried, to whom they asked for assistance, and what they learned from them.

##### *Excerpt 5*

*T: This video looks good? Did you do such editing?*

*S: Actually no, sir. I was assisted by my friend from TKJ (computer technology and networking)*

*T: How did you collaborate?*

*S: What do you mean sir?*

*T: I mean how did you work together?*

*S: I just made a concept, and I told him to edit the video such as creating video opening, cutting the unattractive scenes, adding subtitles, and many others.*

This excerpt revealed that the students made an effort by looking for experts to get assistance. This activity gives the students the opportunity to learn new things. It is necessary to notice that

the focus of this process is not to learn new technology but the way they do things encouraged them to experience social learning. There is a process of knowledge exchange between the students in which they can learn from one another.

#### **4.5. Student active and autonomous learning (planned impact on student active learning)**

Hawkes (2009) stated that digital technology is a tool for active learning. This statement agrees with the finding that the series of activities involving the students' participation in the video-making project promoted the student learning experience as well as their active learning. Furthermore, Sivan et al. (2000) showed evidence that active learning promoted the student autonomous learning which helped the students apply knowledge. During the project, the students had to work on a multitasking activity such as searching for materials, content organization and video-editing while learning new technology (a recording tool). They would look for assistance when they were exposed to a new technology which they were not familiar with. They would ask someone else to help them with the project such as editing the video and finalizing it. This process allowed the students to learn from other people and encouraged their participation and involvement during the project. This setting was a situation where social learning and metacognition activation took place. Given the importance of social interaction in language learning, it will help the learners improve their social and cultural competence. On the other hand, metacognition is likely to constitute a reflection on what the students have experienced and learned from practice.

#### **4.6. Vocabulary building**

The video project is one of the ways of promoting and improving the vocabulary building of the students although further research is still needed to see how it can work well in ELT practice. When working with the video project, the students were exposed to a setting which allowed them to read and find new words. For example, they would be not only familiar with the words associated with past events but they would also find new words related to video technology such as *capture, angle, shot, scene, blurred, cut, format, quality, resolution, etc.* They would have the opportunity to experience and understand the process that shaped learning. When they were working in groups, they would shape their own learning by activating their prior knowledge about the topic they were discussing. Activating the student's prior knowledge will help them to negotiate their ideas and to foster their vocabulary buildup. The more the students are exposed to collaborative learning, the greater their vocabulary mastery.

This research was not to measure how much improvement on vocabulary mastery the students experienced, but to what extent the video project promoted the meaning-making process that shaped learning and vocabulary building. This finding suggests that the EFL teachers should step away from the conventional vocabulary teaching in which the students can now learn new words as they work in a collaborative learning setting. If it is compared to a targeted vocabulary teaching, the students will have limited exposure to a wide range of knowledge and information. Gallo-crail & Zerwekh (2002) stated that if the students are exposed to more diverse strategies, they retained and recalled a greater number of new words. The video project forced them to read, ask questions, raise a discussion and learn new technology while at the same time learn new vocabulary.

#### **4.7. Student's technology skill**

Given that the students of today are digital natives (Prensky, 2001), they are likely to be familiar with technological tools used in education and in daily life. It is not guaranteed that they can utilize a particular technology required for a project. Informed by the findings of this research, some students had encountered problems in using the video-editing software which they were not familiar with. Consequently, they asked someone else for assistance who had a skill in such an area of expertise. Looking for help was a process, and it made meaning for the student's learning in which it encouraged them to learn from their social environment. They had the opportunity to learn new technology from others as it contributed to their cognition although the technological skill was not the focus of the study. Interestingly, some students utilized the Android-based applications to edit the video as the students are now commonly familiar with Android-based smartphones. They could easily download and install the apps from the Google Play store and uninstall them when they were not needed anymore.

#### **4.8. Challenges encountered by the students during the video-making process**

Exposing the students to a video-making project informed a social learning practice which helped them experience a meaning-making process during the activity. Although the process engaged the students in active learning, they also encountered some challenges that hampered them from the actual implementation of the project. Informed by the interviews with the students, the challenges are as follows:

### *1. Student technology skills*

Although the students were all digital natives, they still had problems utilizing some particular tools such as a video-editing tool, a media converter, and Android-based applications. They took the time to learn the new technologies which appeared to be unfamiliar to them. They would need to learn and understand how the applications work as well as get to know all the features and functionalities. This situation brought implications for the students and practice in which they preferred to look for assistance rather than to learn how to utilize the tools on their own. It was due to the student technology skills in that they were not skillful enough to work on such a project. This research suggests that it is simply necessary for teachers to know the student's preferences about technology. It will help the teacher to make a decision which technology tools will work well for the project. For example, the teachers need to know whether or not the students can work on video-editing tools, so the utilization of technology in instruction can be defined. Given the importance of the *Student Technology Competency (STC)*, an initial survey about the STC are simply necessary to give a clear picture of what technology tools will effectively work for the students.

### *2. Internet accessibility*

The ease of access to the Internet became a major problem for the students when looking for online resources for their projects. They could connect to the Internet in two ways: by utilizing campus WiFi service and mobile broadband connection although they both have advantages and disadvantages. The campus WiFi provides free Internet access as well as a cost-saving benefit for the student, but they could only access the hot spot during the office hours or when they were in the coverage area. Based on the institution's policy, the Internet accessibility for the students was limited to only 5 GB/month. Consequently, they had to use the quota wisely if they still wanted to stay in the free mode. Also, they could not use the Internet facility when they were at home. Alternatively, the students had to use their mobile broadband Internet connection which was not affordable for some students due to the high-cost service set by Internet providers. The affordability of the Internet cost became a major issue that hampers students from the use of paid networks. Regarding the completion of the task which required the Internet connection, some students had to wait until the following days to get access.

### *3. Language in use*

Some lexical and grammatical errors were still found in the videos indicating that the students need improvement in those areas. Fundamentally, this research was not focusing on the lexical



and grammatical analysis; this issue should come to further research and investigation. Although the student-created video project had helped the students to participate in the learning process and promoted the active learning they still needed to improve their English proficiency regarding the two aspects.

#### **4.9. Intercultural implications of the video-making task**

During the video-making task, a number of issues were raised as informed by the practice and experience of the participants. Although a video-making task was found interesting and engaging for the students, most of them looked for assistance from other students who had a good competency in using video-editing software. It implies that the tasks dealing with the utilization of technology should have a look at *student-technological competence (STT)* as the main factor affecting the students' performance in completing such a given task. The important notion emerges from the student's answers and experiences concerns that teaching with technology must develop the student's digital literacy and technological competencies (Cartelli & Di Nuzzo, 2013). Bodomomo (2010) also stressed that digital literacy plays an important role in Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC). A piece of important evidence withdrawn from the micro-reality context of the video-making task was the students' performance whose level of digital literacy above the average tend to explore the technological tools that they were about to use in their project. They learned the application very rapidly and auto didactically without seeking assistance. Although the students are all *digital natives* (Prensky, 2001), it is too vague to assume that they will not have problems when they are exposed to a technology-rich environment. Positively, the situation encouraged them to actively learn the new things which they have not dealt with before. They would read some articles, ask some experts in the relevant field, watch video tutorials on the Internet, download various applications from the application store (android/iOS), as well as compare their effectiveness and easiness of use.

The Internet technology has grown very rapidly and widely opened the windows of knowledge and information. Working in a micro-reality context of the video-making task, the students spent more time in searching for online references for their task. The Internet-based resources are more accessible for the students in which they can access, open, and read/watch from their hand-held devices (smartphone, tablet, or iPad). The research suggests that we need to empower our students to utilize the Internet-based resources (video streaming site and ESL blogs/webpages) to improve their intercultural competencies by learning from other cultures and transforming the knowledge into their learning practice. It brought implications as regards the learning culture of the students who tend to rely on the Internet as the biggest corpus

knowledge in the world. The students' learning culture and the use of technology will have an important effect on student knowledge-sharing. For instance, a student who has a digital learning culture tends to change his/her reading habit where everything relies on technological tools and Internet technology as a medium for knowledge-search and sharing.

The following table illustrates the meaning-making activities of the participants that reveal resources, common preferred settings, technological tools and types of activities during the task. Grounded in the four-phase practical inquiry model (Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2001), a sociocognitive process went through four stages: 1) triggering (identifying potential problems emerges from the experience), 2) exploration (exchanging ideas and discussing ambiguities), 3) integration (connecting ideas to construct new meaning), and 4) resolution (applying new ideas and defending solutions). The students' experience working on the video-making task revealed some problems and they were able to identify the difficulties within the group discussions and group works. For example, teamwork decided to find out resources on the Internet, choose a setting, select technological tools, and perform relevant activities based on their prior knowledge, current experience, and the required competencies pertaining the task. The idea of not using a digital camera and Handycam was informed by the students' experience and discussion within the group. In terms of collaborative learning, the task involved 2 to 3 students working together to search for understanding, meaning, and solution for the task. Gokhale (1995) stresses that working in a group will potentially promote learning rather than individual work.

Table 3. The meaning-making activities of the participants during the task

Meaning-making activities	Resources	Common Preferred Settings	Technological tools	Types of activities
Student-prepared materials before the video-taking session	- Webpages - Discussion notes - Books	Beyond the classroom (rent house, parks, library, and campus yards)	- Internet - Laptop - Smartphones	- Group discussion - Group work - Job distribution - Internet search
Student-selected scene-setting	- Classroom facilities - Campus facilities	In campus settings (classrooms, faculty lobby, sports center, laboratory, and library)	- Video camera	- Scene backgrounding - Lighting - Lay outing
Student-selected recording tools	- Apps store (android or iOS)	On hand-held devices	- Smartphone - Tablet - iPad	- application download, install and remove - application selection - application test

---

						- choosing an application for use in the task
Student-selected video editing tools	- video editing tools	On hand-held devices		- Smartphone		- editing the videos (with assistance)
	- the android-based video editing application			- Tablet		- discussing the editing results
				- iPad		- submitting the videos
						- reviewing the video (with the teacher/lecturer)

---

## 5. Conclusion

Creating a video was not the main point of this research, but it was supposed to see what was happening during the process that made learning meaningful. In ELT, working on a video project is one of the many meaning-making processes which can promote the students' active learning. A myriad of online resources and the teacher-student ease of access to them can potentially be explored as the alternative approaches to language learning, particularly in this digital world. Informed by the process of student-created video strategy, learning can be activated if they are involved in the learning process rather than treating them as passive learners. Therefore, they can directly experience the pace and the real context of learning in which the activity triggers their participation and engagement as active learners, decision-makers, and problem solvers.

For a better implementation of this student-created video project, this research recommends to initially equip the students with required technological skills before asking them to work on a specific task involving technology. By doing this, the students will get a clear picture of the project and understand the procedures of doing it. This issue should not be taken for granted given the importance of STTC is a perennial factor in implementing the video-making project is necessary.

## Acknowledgment

A special acknowledgment goes to the head of the language laboratory of the State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang who had provided access to the language lab and its facilities.

## References

- Baker, A. (2016). Active learning with interactive videos: creating student-guided learning materials. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, 2918(September), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2016.1206776>

- Bangs, P. (1990). Case study: Interactive video and language learning. *Innovations in Education & Training International*, 27(2), 146-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1355800900270203>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful Qualitative Research. A Practical Guide for Beginners*. Retrieved from <http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/21156>
- Cartelli, A., & Di Nuzzo, A. (2013). Digital literacy and competence in students attending a faculty of humanities. In: A. Cartelli (Ed.), *Fostering 21st Century Digital Literacy and Technical Competency* (pp. 55-64). Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference/ IGI Global.
- Chiang, S. C., & Dunkel, P. (1992). The effect of speech modification, prior knowledge, and listening proficiency on EFL lecture learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(2), 130-159.
- Ellis, R. (2006). The methodology of Task-Based Teaching. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 8(3), 19-45.
- Engin, M. (2014). Extending the flipped classroom model: Developing second language writing skills through student-created digital videos. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 14(5), 12-26. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotlv14i5.12829>
- Gallo-crail, R., & Zerwekh, R. (2002). Language learning and the internet: Student strategies in vocabulary acquisition. In C. A. Spren (Ed.), *New Technologies and Language Learning: Cases in the Commonly Taught Languages*. Technical report #25 (pp. 55-79). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2001). Critical thinking, cognitive presence, and computer conferencing in distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 7-23.
- Bodomo, A. B. (2010). (ed.) *Computer-Mediated Communication for Linguistics and Literacy: Technology and Natural Language Education*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference/ IGI Global.
- Gokhale, A. A. (1995). Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology Education*, 7(1). Retrieved from <https://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v7n1/gokhale.jte-v7n1.html#about author>
- Hawkes, R. (2009). Digital technology as a tool for active learning in MFL: Engaging language learners in and beyond the secondary classroom. In M. Evans (Ed.), *Foreign-Language Learning with Digital Technology* (pp. 80-103). London; New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Hughes, J., & Robertson, L. (2010). Transforming practice: Using digital video to engage students. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 10(1), 20-37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664539700200032>
- Kelly, R. (1985). Video and language learning: An approach to viewing comprehension. *RELC Journal*, 16(1), 52-67.
- Lin, L. (2011). The video comprehension strategies of Chinese-speaking university students. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 45(3), 297-319. <https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.45.3.c>
- Lund, A. (2003). *The Teacher as Interface: Teachers of EFL in ICT-Rich Environments. Beliefs, Practices, Appropriation*. Oslo: The University of Oslo.
- Motteram, G. (2013). *Innovations in Learning Technologies for English Language Teaching*. London: British Council.
- Naqvi, S. (2015). Student created digital video and language learning: Voices from Omani classrooms. *Third 21st CAF Conference at Harvard, in Boston*, 6(1), 246-259.
- Nunan, D. (2006). Task-based Language Teaching in the Asia context: Defining 'task.' *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 8(3), 12-18.

- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10748121111107708>
- Richards, J. C. (2015). The changing face of language learning: Learning beyond the classroom. *RELC Journal*, 46(1), 5-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214561621>
- Sherer, P., & Shea, T. (2011). Using online video to support student learning and engagement. *College Teaching*, 59(2), 56-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2010.511313>
- Shih, R.-C. (2010). Blended learning using video-based blogs: Public speaking for English as a Second Language students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26, 883-897. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.usherbrooke.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ906894&site=ehost-live>;
- Shrosbree, M. (2008). Digital video in the language classroom. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 4(1), 75-84.
- Sindoni, M. G. (2011). Online conversations: A sociolinguistic investigation into young adults' use of videochats. *Classroom Discourse*, 2, 219-235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2011.614055>
- Sivan, A., Leung, R. W., Woon, C. C., & Kember, D. (2000). An implementation of active learning and its effect on the quality of student learning. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 37(4), 381-389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135580000750052991>
- Terantino, J. M. (2011). Emerging technologies, YouTube for foreign languages: You have to see this video. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(1), 10-16. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/february2011/emerging.pdf>
- Theron, L., & Theron, A. (2014). Meaning-making and resilience: Case studies of a multifaceted process. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 24(1), 37-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2014.904099>
- Thomas, M., & Reinders, H. (2010). Deconstructing tasks and technology. In: M. Thomas, H. Reinders (eds.), *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching with Technology*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=QGkzsQ4HaoC&pgis=1>
- Ting, N. C. (2013). Classroom video project: An investigation on students' perception. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90(InCULT 2012), 441-448. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.113>
- Wagener, D. (2006). Promoting independent learning skills using video on digital language laboratories. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 19(4-5), 279-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220601043180>
- Widodo, H. P., Budi, A. B., & Wijayanti, F. (2016). Poetry writing 2.0: Learning to write creatively in a blended language learning environment. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 13(1), 30-48.
- Young, C. A., & Bush, J. (2004). Teaching the English language arts with technology: A critical approach and pedagogical framework. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 4(1), 1-22.